



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,485	01/13/2006	Lysander Chrisstoffels	13111-00029-US1	9881
23416 7590 10/19/2010 CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ, LLP P O BOX 2207 WILMINGTON, DE 19899				
EXAMINER				
LEA, CHRISTOPHER RAYMOND				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1613				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/19/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/564,485

Applicant(s)

CHRISSTOFFELS ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher R. Lea

Art Unit

1613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This application is a 371 (national stage application) of PCT/EP04/07741.

Receipt of Amendments/Remarks filed on August 11, 2010, is acknowledged. In response to non-final Office Action dated May 11, 2010, applicant amended claim 1 and added no new claims. Claims 1-24 are pending. Claims 1-16 are under examination.

Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
4. Claims 1-12 & 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hossel et al. (US PreGrant Publication 2001/0021375, hereafter Hossel1).

Applicant claims

Applicant claims an aqueous polymeric dispersion obtainable from the free-radical polymerization of mixture of a) at least one α,β -ethylenically unsaturated amide-containing monomer, b) a crosslinking monomer containing two α,β -ethylenically unsaturated double bonds, and c) a monomer containing an α,β -ethylenically unsaturated double bond and a cationic or cationogenic group, in an aqueous medium in the presence of an aqueous polymeric anionic dispersant D).

Determination of the scope and content of the prior art (MPEP 2141.01)

Hossel1 teaches, as a whole, a cosmetic light protection formulation comprising a polymeric composition (abstract).

Hossel1 teaches a copolymer obtained by the free-radical polymerization of a mixture of monomers ([0060]), where in the monomers used include (a) N-vinylimidazoles ([0023], corresponds to c) in the instant claims), (b) N-vinylactams ([0040], corresponds to a) in the instant claims), and optionally (e) crosslinking monomers such as triallylamine ([0058], corresponds to b) in the instant claims). Hossel1 teaches that the mixtures can be mixed with conventional polymers such as acrylic acid homopolymers ([0094]-[0096], corresponding to D) in the instant claims). Hossel1 teaches that additional monomers may be used in the composition including monomer (c) which includes compounds such as (meth)acrylic acid, crotonic acid and itaconic acid ([0042] corresponds to e) in the instant claims) and monomer (d) which includes C₁-C₄₀ alkyl esters of (meth)acrylic acids ([0043] corresponds to d) in the instant claims). Hossel1 teaches that the polymeric composition comprises 0.01-99.99% monomer (a), 0.01-99.99% of monomer (b), 0-50% each of monomers (c) & (d), and 0-10% monomer (e) ([0011]). Hossel1 teaches that the pH of the mixture can be adjusted to a physiologically compatible pH ([0038]). Hossel1 teaches that the polymeric solids can but do not need to be isolated from the dispersion ([0063]-[0064]).

As to the claimed light transmittance, where the claimed and prior art products are substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established. Further, The U.S. Patent Office is not equipped with analytical instruments to test prior art compositions for the infinite number of ways that a subsequent applicant may present previously unmeasured characteristics. When as here, the prior art appears to contain

the exact same ingredients and applicant's own disclosure supports the suitability of the prior art composition as the inventive composition component, the burden is properly shifted to applicant to show otherwise. Absent evidence to the contrary, the prior art composition must possess the claimed light transmittance, since it is substantially identical to the claimed composition (See MPEP § 2112.01).

**Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims
(MPEP 2141.02)**

The difference between the teachings of Hossel1 and the instant claims is that Hossel1 does not exemplify an embodiment of the invention possessing the polymer dispersant.

**Finding of *prima facie* obviousness
Rationale and Motivation (MPEP 2142-2143)**

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to formulate a polymer dispersion according to the teachings of Hossel1 and produce the instant invention. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to add a polymer dispersant because Hossel1 teaches that the polymeric composition can be combined with conventional polymer dispersants such as homo- and copolymers of acrylic acid (*supra*).

From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in formulating a polymer dispersion according to the teachings of Hossel1 and producing the claimed invention.

Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

5. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hossel1 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kim et al. (WO2001/062809 using US PreGrant Publication 2003/0147929 as translation).

Applicant claims

Applicant claims an aqueous polymeric dispersion obtainable from the free-radical polymerization of mixture of a) at least one α,β -ethylenically unsaturated amide-containing monomer, b) a crosslinking monomer containing two α,β -ethylenically unsaturated double bonds, and c) a monomer containing an α,β -ethylenically unsaturated double bond and a cationic or cationogenic group, in an aqueous medium in the presence of an aqueous polymeric anionic dispersant D).

Determination of the scope and content of the prior art (MPEP 2141.01)

The teachings of Hossel1 are laid out above.

Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims (MPEP 2141.02)

The difference between the teachings of Hossel1 and the instant claims is that Hossel1 does not teach including a polymerization regulator. This deficiency in Hossel1 is cured by the teachings of Kim et al.

Kim et al. teach, as a whole, a cosmetic agent comprising a copolymer (abstract).

Kim et al. teach a copolymer obtained by the free-radical polymerization of a mixture of monomers ([0179]), where in the monomers used include (b) N-vinylactams ([0054], corresponds to a) in the instant claims), (c) N-vinylimidazoles ([0072], corresponds to c) in the instant claims), and optionally (f) crosslinking monomers such as triallylamine ([0103], corresponds to b) in the instant claims). Kim et al. teach that additional monomers may be used in the composition including monomer(d) which includes C₁-C₄₀ alkyl esters of (meth)acrylic acids ([0082] corresponds to d) in the instant claims) and monomer (e) which includes compounds such as (meth)acrylic acid, crotonic acid and itaconic acid ([0042] corresponds to e) in the instant claims). Kim et al. teaches that the polymeric composition comprises 25-90% of monomer (b), 0.5-30% each of monomers (c), 0-30% of monomer (d), and 0.001-4% of monomer (f) ([0036]-[0038] & [0102]). Kim et al. teach that a regulator can be added to the polymerization mixture to control the K-value (a polymer parameter related to chain length of the polymer molecules and bulk viscosity of the polymer in solution) of the resulting polymer ([0188]-[0189]). Kim et al. teach that the polymeric solids can but do not need to be isolated from the dispersion ([0189]).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to add a regulator as taught by Kim et al. to the polymerizable mixture of Hossel1 and produce the instant invention. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to add a regulator because Kim et al. teach that the regulator can be used to control the K-value of the polymer (which in turns controls the viscosity of the polymer).

From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in adding a regulator as taught by Kim et al. to the polymerizable mixture of Hossel1 and producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

6. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-12, & 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Dieing et al. (US Patent 6,682,725).

The applied reference has a common inventor and assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not

claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

Applicant claims

Applicant claims an aqueous polymeric dispersion obtainable from the free-radical polymerization of mixture of a) at least one α,β -ethylenically unsaturated amide-containing monomer, b) a crosslinking monomer containing two α,β -ethylenically unsaturated double bonds, and c) a monomer containing an α,β -ethylenically unsaturated double bond and a cationic or cationogenic group, in an aqueous medium in the presence of an aqueous polymeric anionic dispersant D).

Determination of the scope and content of the prior art (MPEP 2141.01)

Dieing et al. teach, as a whole, a cosmetic hair composition comprising a polymeric composition (abstract).

Dieing et al. teach a copolymer obtained by the free-radical polymerization of a mixture of monomers (column 2, lines 40-43), where in the monomers used include (a) N-vinylimidazoles (column 2, line 65 through column 3, line 64, corresponds to c) in the instant claims), (b) N-vinyl lactams (column 4, lines 14-23, corresponds to a) in the

instant claims), and (d) crosslinking monomers such as triallylamine (column 4, line 44, through column 6, line 8, corresponds to b) in the instant claims). Dieing et al. teach that the mixtures can be mixed with conventional polymers such as acrylic acid homopolymers (column 6, line 62 through column 7, line 14, corresponding to D) in the instant claims). Dieing et al. teach that additional monomers may be used in the composition including monomer (c) which includes C₁-C₂₄ alkyl esters of (meth)acrylic acids (column 4, lines 38-43, corresponds to d) in the instant claims). Dieing et al. teaches that the polymeric composition comprises 1-99.99% monomer (a), 0-98.99% of monomer (b), 0-50% of monomer (c), and 0.01-10% monomer (d) (column 2, lines 44-60).

As to the claimed light transmittance, where the claimed and prior art products are substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established. Further, The U.S. Patent Office is not equipped with analytical instruments to test prior art compositions for the infinite number of ways that a subsequent applicant may present previously unmeasured characteristics. When as here, the prior art appears to contain the exact same ingredients and applicant's own disclosure supports the suitability of the prior art composition as the inventive composition component, the burden is properly shifted to applicant to show otherwise. Absent evidence to the contrary, the prior art composition must possess the claimed light transmittance, since it is substantially identical to the claimed composition (See MPEP § 2112.01).

**Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims
(MPEP 2141.02)**

The difference between the teachings of Dieing et al. and the instant claims is that Dieing et al. do not exemplify an embodiment of the invention possessing the polymer dispersant.

**Finding of *prima facie* obviousness
Rationale and Motivation (MPEP 2142-2143)**

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to formulate a polymer dispersion according to the teachings of Dieing et al. and produce the instant invention. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to add a polymer dispersant because Dieing et al. teaches that the polymeric composition can be combined with conventional polymer dispersants such as homo- and copolymers of acrylic acid (*supra*).

From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in formulating a polymer dispersion according to the teachings of Dieing et al. and producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

7. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-12, & 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Hössel et al. (US Patent 7,422,735, hereafter Hossel2).

The applied reference has a common inventor and assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

Applicant claims

Applicant claims an aqueous polymeric dispersion obtainable from the free-radical polymerization of mixture of a) at least one α,β -ethylenically unsaturated amide-containing monomer, b) a crosslinking monomer containing two α,β -ethylenically unsaturated double bonds, and c) a monomer containing an α,β -ethylenically unsaturated double bond and a cationic or cationogenic group, in an aqueous medium in the presence of an aqueous polymeric anionic dispersant D).

**Determination of the scope and content of the prior art
(MPEP 2141.01)**

Hossel2 teaches, as a whole, a cosmetic dermatological formulation comprising a polymeric composition (abstract).

Hossel2 teaches a copolymer obtained by the free-radical polymerization of a mixture of monomers (column 2, lines 37-39), where in the monomers used include (a) N-vinylimidazoles (column 2, line 66 through column 4, line 41, corresponds to c) in the instant claims), (b) N-vinyl lactams (column 4, lines 42-57, corresponds to a) in the instant claims), and (e) crosslinking monomers such as triallylamine (column 5, line 23 through column 6, line 51, corresponds to b) in the instant claims). Hossel2 teaches that the mixtures can be mixed with conventional polymers such as acrylic acid homopolymers (column 9, lines 20-43, corresponding to D) in the instant claims). Hossel2 teaches that additional monomers may be used in the composition including monomer (c) which includes compounds such as (meth)acrylic acid, crotonic acid and itaconic acid (column 4, lines 58-65, corresponds to e) in the instant claims) and monomer (d) which includes C₁-C₄₀ alkyl esters of (meth)acrylic acids (column 4, line 66 through column 5, line 22, corresponds to d) in the instant claims). Hossel2 teaches that the polymeric composition comprises 1-99.99% monomer (a), 0-98.99% of monomer (b), 0-50% each of monomers (c) & (d), and 0.01-10% monomer (e) (column 2, lines 40-60).

As to the claimed light transmittance, where the claimed and prior art products are substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established. Further,

The U.S. Patent Office is not equipped with analytical instruments to test prior art compositions for the infinite number of ways that a subsequent applicant may present previously unmeasured characteristics. When as here, the prior art appears to contain the exact same ingredients and applicant's own disclosure supports the suitability of the prior art composition as the inventive composition component, the burden is properly shifted to applicant to show otherwise. Absent evidence to the contrary, the prior art composition must possess the claimed light transmittance, since it is substantially identical to the claimed composition (See MPEP § 2112.01).

**Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims
(MPEP 2141.02)**

The difference between the teachings of Hossel2 and the instant claims is that Hossel2 does not exemplify an embodiment of the invention possessing the polymer dispersant.

**Finding of *prima facie* obviousness
Rationale and Motivation (MPEP 2142-2143)**

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to formulate a polymer dispersion according to the teachings of Hossel2 and produce the instant invention. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to add a polymer dispersant because Hossel2 teaches that the polymeric composition can be combined with conventional polymer dispersants such as homo- and copolymers of acrylic acid (*supra*).

From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in formulating a polymer dispersion according to the teachings of Hossel² and producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

In light of the forgoing discussion, one of ordinary skill in the art would have concluded that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 USC 103(a).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed August 11, 2010, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the prior art rejections do not teach the limitations that the polymeric dispersion is obtained by free-radical polymerization of a monomer mixture M) "in an aqueous medium in the presence of at least one polymeric anionic dispersant D)". Respectfully, the examiner finds applicant's argument defective for a few reasons. First, the language of claim 1 may be reasonably interpreted as embracing a polymeric dispersion where the polymer is formed by free-radical polymerization which is then dispersed "in an aqueous medium in the presence of at least one polymeric anionic dispersant". That is, the language of the claim does not, as applicant asserts, require the dispersant to be present during the polymerization. Second, selection of any order

of adding ingredients is *prima facie* obvious, in the absence of unexpected results (See MPEP § 2144.04 IV.C) Finally, assuming *arguendo* that applicant were correct and that the dispersant is required to be present during the polymerization, the claim is a product-by-process claim, and, as such, the patentability depends on the structure of the product, not the process steps. Clearly the prior art teach polymeric dispersions comprising the claimed polymer (made from the claimed monomer mixture) and the polymeric dispersant; therefore, the burden is on applicant to show that the claimed process results in an unobvious difference between the prior art and claimed inventions (See MPEP § 2113).

Applicant further attempts to establish the criticality of the dispersant being present during the polymerization by pointing to example 1 and comparative example 1 on page 43 of the specification. Respectfully, this data does not support the applicant's conclusion. Example 1 is a polymeric dispersion made by polymerizing vinyl pyrrolidone, N-vinyl-2-methylimidazolium methylsulfate, and triallylamine, wherein the polymerization is carried out in the presence of an acrylic acid-maleic acid copolymer. Comparative example 1 is polymeric dispersion (presumably) made by polymerizing vinyl pyrrolidone, N-vinyl-2-methylimidazolium methylsulfate, and triallylamine. Comparative example 1 is not a polymeric dispersion made by polymerizing vinyl pyrrolidone, N-vinyl-2-methylimidazolium methylsulfate, and triallylamine, wherein the polymer is dispersed in an aqueous medium in the presence of an acrylic acid-maleic acid copolymer. The data, therefore, establishes that the dispersant is necessary in the dispersion, not, as applicant asserts, that it is necessary to be present during the

polymerization. Further, even if applicant's example showed what applicant asserts, the single narrow example in the specification does not establish that this result holds for the broad scope of the independent claim.

The expected result remains the same; a polymeric dispersion is made in the absence of evidence to the contrary. No unexpected results have been presented. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is maintained.

Conclusion

Claims 1-16 are rejected. Claims 17-24 are withdrawn. No claims are allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher R. Lea whose telephone number is (571) 270-5870. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30-3:30 ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Kwon can be reached on (571)272-0581. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ernst V Arnold/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1613

/C. R. L./
Examiner, Art Unit 1613

crl